

BY-LAWS FOR DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Article I. Name:

The name of this unit is the Department of English in the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities of the University of West Florida.

Article II. Voting Membership:

The department's voting membership shall consist of faculty who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior instructor, senior lecturer, instructor, or lecturer. All other persons affiliated with the department (adjunct faculty and visiting faculty of any designation) are invited to participate in faculty meetings but are not extended voting privileges. In some years, the chair may request volunteers from adjunct and visiting faculty to serve on committees because of their particular experience and expertise.

This definition of voting membership applies throughout these by-laws with the exception of matters concerning Tenure and Promotion of faculty.

Faculty Additions:

In the event that a faculty position becomes open and permission is granted by the University to conduct a search, the department faculty shall have input regarding the type of applicant to be sought. A faculty search committee shall be formed consisting of members appointed by the chair.

The committee's duties include following the procedures outlined for faculty hiring by the Office of Academic Affairs. The committee's procedures shall be consistent with Sunshine Law. The committee drafts search materials including advertisements and selection criteria and submits these to the chair for approval prior to publication.

The committee reviews applications and forwards to the faculty a pool of top candidates. The faculty will assess the strengths and limitations of the candidates. The faculty may also provide additional input regarding candidate invitations and the selection of finalists by the hiring official(s).

Article III. Department Chair:

Under current university policy, department chairs are appointed to one-year contracts from August to August, and are subject to annual performance review by the Dean of the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities. In addition, the chair's performance will be formally reviewed by the department at the end of the second year of the chair's service. It will be the responsibility of the chair

to elicit this second-year review, and that of the faculty, in consultation with the chair, to determine the format for providing it.

The department adopts an "elected" and "short-term" conception of its chair. "Election" is, of course, subject to ratification by the dean, who appoints the chair.

An elected chair can expect to serve a term of three consecutive years. If a chair takes a sabbatical or other leave, that interlude shall be considered part of the chair's elected term.

No later than 5 April in the third year of a term, the voting members anonymously will submit nominations, together with a nominee's stated agreement to serve if elected. No later than 20 April, the voting members will vote upon the nominees by secret ballot in a department meeting. An incumbent chair may be nominated for re-election.

A retiring chair shall be expected to advise and assist the elected successor at least through the term prior to the commencement of the succeeding chair.

Article IV. Committee Structure:

A. Ad Hoc Committees

As circumstances may require, the department chair is empowered to constitute and charge ad hoc committees. In memoranda or agenda, the chair shall propose committee memberships to the faculty as a whole for ratification. The chair shall, for example, appoint ad hoc "search committees" as staff positions are budgeted and "tenure mentoring committees" in accordance with the procedures summarized in Article VI.F. below. In addition to tenured faculty members from within the department, tenure mentoring committees **MAY** include a non-departmental tenured faculty member.

B. Standing Committees:

1. There shall be standing committees of the department:

a. Planning/Governance Committee:

Charge: To consult with the chair and the department in matters respecting the department's internal governance, its response to changes in college and university policy, and its long-term prospects and needs. To consult with the department and assist the chair in preparing "self-study" reports.

Membership: The department chair and the chairs of the standing committees.

b. Composition Committee:

Charge: To advise and assist the chair in the selection and orientation of temporary faculty and adjuncts teaching composition courses. In collaboration with concerned faculty, to research and propose new programs and offerings. To develop a system of coordination for the entire composition program. To consider alternative methods of staffing composition programs.

Membership: At least two faculty members, the director of composition, the director of the Writing Laboratory, one non-voting graduate student, and one adjunct or visiting instructor. The adjunct or visitor will not participate in deliberations on personnel.

c. Curriculum Committee:

Charge: To review the nature and the sequencing of courses, departmental degree requirements and advisement policies. In collaboration with concerned faculty, to research and propose new programs and offerings. To consult with instructors and to make recommendations to the department chair in developing yearly schedules of and staffing for course offerings. To advise the chair in awarding financial support to students.

Membership: At least three faculty members.

d. Graduate Committee:

Charge: To review the nature, admission policies, degree requirements, advisement policies, and student funding procedures for the graduate program. In collaboration with concerned faculty, to research and propose new programs and offerings. To consult with graduate instructors and to make recommendations to the department chair in developing yearly schedules of and staffing for graduate course offerings. To advise the chair in awarding financial support to graduate students. To oversee any operation or policy that affects the graduate program.

Membership: At least three faculty members.

e. Creative Writing Committee:

Charge: To review the nature, admission policies, degree requirements, advisement policies, publications, and student funding procedures for the Creative Writing program. In collaboration with concerned faculty, to research and propose new programs and offerings. To make recommendations to the chair regarding the Creative Writing program. To advise the chair in awarding financial support to Creative Writing program students. To oversee any operation or policy that affects the Creative Writing program.

Membership: The Director of Creative Writing and at least two other faculty members.

f. Online Course Development Committee:

Charge: To make recommendations concerning the development of online courses and online enhancement of traditional courses. The Committee will monitor and periodically report on developments in course designs and uses of technology in online and blended courses.

Membership: At least three full-time faculty members who teach online courses.

h. Assessment Committee

Charge: To design tools and implement procedures to gather adequate, proper and usable data to ensure that intended pedagogical goals are being met in all courses graduate and undergraduate; to evaluate/assess gathered data and report results to the Department faculty, suggesting changes whenever necessary; to assist the chair in presenting assessment data upon demand, especially in regard to annual reports to the Dean and Provost, and to state and national accrediting bodies.

Membership: At least four full-time faculty members, including 1) the Director of Composition; 2) the coordinator of lower-division courses that qualify as General Education (e.g., Introduction to Literature); 3) the Director of Creative Writing; 4) a representative from the Graduate Committee.

2. Method of staffing:

The standing committees shall be staffed in accordance with the procedure employed for staffing ad hoc committees. The department chair shall announce committee appointments for the next twelve months by the second week of fall semester. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner.

3. Procedures:

The department chair will nominate committee chairs for committee ratification. A committee may at its option reject the chair's nomination and elect its own chair.

Article V: Departmental Meetings

A. The department chair shall convene meetings of the voting membership, and others as deemed necessary, at least twice in each fall and spring semester.

B. By a signed petition, a majority of the voting membership may direct the chair to convene a timely department meeting.

C. Meetings shall be announced and agendas developed and distributed in a timely fashion by the chair. In preparing agendas, the chair shall:

1. No fewer than four working days prior to a department meeting, distribute to all faculty a draft agenda, including as relevant items to be introduced, reported, and/or recommended for debate and/or action. When prioritizing items on the department meeting agenda, the Chair shall prioritize items requiring immediate attention including, but not limited to, items requiring a department vote and items requiring a department discussion or deliberation. Informational items not requiring a vote or discussion and not deemed as "requiring immediate attention" shall be held until the completion of the prioritized items;

2. Solicit proposals for additional agenda items from the faculty;

3. Circulate a firm agenda, taking into account faculty proposals, by the end of the day prior to the scheduled meeting.

D. The department chair shall conduct meetings following accepted procedures for motions and voting.

E. Voting shall be by voice or by show of hand, although any member present may demand a roll call on any proposition. A majority of those present may demand a vote by secret ballot on any proposition. Elections shall be by secret ballot. Alternatively, voting may be conducted via email.

F. If a faculty member is unable to attend a meeting, that member may grant a written or electronic proxy to another member for the purpose of voting on specified items from the prepared agenda.

G. A majority of the voting membership shall constitute a quorum.

H. Where not governed by Florida statutes, the Collective Bargaining Agreement, university policy, or other sections of the English departmental bylaws, the department will utilize a majority vote of the voting membership to determine departmental matters related to governance, curriculum, lines, and general department function and direction.

I. The department chair shall vote only in the event of a tie. The chair shall, however, vote in the selection of a chair and on candidacies for faculty appointment.

J. In the chair's absence, the faculty member present who is senior in rank and tenure shall preside.

K. The office administrator of the Department, or designee thereof, shall be responsible for the taking of the minutes as a permanent record of department faculty meetings. The office administrator is responsible for keeping and distributing the minutes as required by these by-laws. The minutes are to be distributed to the members of the faculty within ten working days of the meeting for which the minutes were taken.

Article VI. Tenure and Promotion.

Candidates for Tenure and Promotion are assessed in Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service consistent with the terms of the individual contract. The Chair and the candidate shall ensure that these terms are clearly stated in the Tenure and Promotion application. The department recognizes that, as faculty members have varying work assignments, the chair should have some discretion when writing annual evaluations to allow for the diversity of faculty strengths and accomplishments.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION

The following categories shall be used in evaluating faculty efforts in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service for the purposes of Annual Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion.

- Exceeds Expectations : Exceeds Department standards for professional performance. in quality or quantity or both.
- Meets Expectations: Meets Department standards for professional performance.
- Does Not Meet Expectations: Does not meet Department standards for professional performance.
- Unsatisfactory: Disregard or failure to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance

involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

A. Statement on Teaching:

The quality of teaching may be demonstrated by evidence bearing on the following considerations:

1. Student response to course content and presentation.
2. Course and work-assignment related mentoring, including student conferences, theses, publications, directed studies, and supervision of interns.
3. Course syllabi and other course-related documents and media.
4. Intellectual demands made upon students, including quality of tests and other assignments.
5. Students' progress in mastering course content.
6. Instructor's estimate of success in fulfilling course objectives.
7. Revisions, innovations, maintenance, and development of established and new courses.
8. Activity undertaken for professional growth that will enhance the instructor's effectiveness as a teacher.
9. Facilitation of faculty or student professional development workshops, conference(s), or symposia that enhance the production of teacher or student knowledge.
10. Design and implementation of university or faculty-initiated assessment procedures, protocols, and instruments that measure student learning outcomes and program effectiveness.
11. Documents reflecting peer-reviews and/or classroom observations that comply with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
12. Evidence of teaching initiatives to meet program, department, or university goals and standards.

The items outlined in this section also constitute additional departmental "Acceptable supplemental exemplars" of teaching quality as defined in Article 11.2 "Sources and Methods of Evaluation" of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

B. Statement on Scholarly and Creative Activity:

In the discipline of language, literature, and writing, scholarship yields tangible evidence of research, inclusive of both single- and multiple-author publications, in such areas as literary history, rhetorical and composition history and theory, writing program administration, criticism, bibliography, development and curation of online projects, the nature of language, and pedagogy related to the discipline. Creative activity includes the writing or translation of prose fictions, essays, plays, or poems. Communicating the results of this scholarly or creative activity through publication, production, or the reading of papers at

professional meetings is the goal of research and writing in the discipline. The judgment of peers as to the quality of the work, not merely its quantity, is the basis for evaluation of a faculty member's performance in the areas described. Publication, production, or formal reading of a paper at a professional meeting that implies assessment of the work in a regional, national, or international context provides important evidence bearing on such an evaluation.

The professional and scholarly fields of expertise represented within the Department of English vary so widely that a comprehensive list of all possible ways to meet criteria for promotion and tenure would become unwieldy and confusing. Anticipating the need for faculty members to be informed of the application of those criteria to their own disciplines and specialties, the chair assigns a mentoring committee of senior faculty to each new tenure-earning faculty member. The mentoring committees meet periodically with assigned faculty members, assess their portfolios, and inform them in writing of the committee's assessments. The committee reports are also forwarded to the chair, the dean, and the provost for their consideration. That process is repeated each year until the faculty member either earns tenure and promotion to associate professor or departs.

C. Statement on Service:

In accord with the public service mission of the University, consistent performance of service is expected of all members of the Department of English. Such service includes contribution to the discipline, to the University, to the Department, and to the community. In the context of Administrative positions such as Director of Composition, Director of Creative Writing, and Department Chair, quality of service is demonstrated by program creation, revision, design and implementation of goals and outcomes. The above listed examples of Administrative service are not intended to be interpreted as exhaustive or prescriptive. Any reviewing body should consult the individual candidate's work assignment for clarification of a candidate's appropriate service exceptions.

D. Statement on Evaluation of Program Directors, Coordinators, and Departmental Administrators

Program coordination is a required part of the workload and hiring contract for many program directors, coordinators, and administrators within the Department of English. These positions (inclusive of, but not limited to, the directors, coordinators, and administrators of the multiple writing programs within the department, and the Writing Lab) entail specialized expertise in disciplinary knowledge, theory, and pedagogical practice. Many program directors engage in the following tasks that inform and constitute teaching, service, and scholastic activity:

- Program creation and design
- Program assessment and evaluation
- Grant award projects
- Custom curricular design and textbook production
- Teacher-Training and professional development
- Institutional research and cross-disciplinary collaboration
- Theory demonstrated through pedagogical/assessment praxis

E. Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review: Criteria

1. A period of yearly reappointment at the assistant professor level is justified by sustained accomplishments in teaching, appropriate service, and significant evidence of scholarship/creative activities.
2. In accord with University policies, except in extraordinary circumstances, the yearly reappointment period at the assistant professor level shall be understood to be no fewer than five and no more than six years.
3. Credit for in-rank teaching at another institution may be considered in individual cases.
4. The decision to recommend tenure is a vote of confidence in the candidate's demonstrated capacity for scholarly and professional growth. Thus, the department will not ordinarily recommend an assistant professor for tenure unless the candidate has accomplishments in teaching and scholarship which warrant a simultaneous recommendation of promotion.

5. Tenure and Promotion to Associate

In evaluating scholarly and creative production, we consider the quality of publication. The candidate's success in developing a national reputation in the field is at least as important as the quantity of work produced. We take a variety of factors into consideration, including but not limited to, acceptance rate, peer review or competitive editorial policy, disciplinary esteem and reputation, audience, citations, and length and breadth of study. The successful candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor has produced a body of work deemed significant by nationally recognized experts in the field.

6. Promotion to Full

In evaluating scholarly and creative production, we again consider the quality of publication. The candidate's success in having established a national reputation in the field is at least as important as the quantity of work produced. We take a variety of factors into consideration, including but not limited to, acceptance rate, peer review or competitive editorial policy, disciplinary esteem and reputation, audience, citations, and length and breadth of study. Successful candidates for full professor are recognized authorities in their areas of expertise.

7. Considerations in the Adoption of Performance Indicators for Scholarship and Creative Activities

The Department of English adopts performance indicators for scholarship and creative projects that take into consideration issues of both quality and frequency of production, where relevant and that are consistent with the university's mission, vision, and resources to support scholarly and creative work. The Department of English considers a broad range of activities that express its mission and vision. Scholarship and creative projects must be externally reviewed and publicly available. These projects include the following:

- Creation, production, exhibition, artistic performance, or publication of works by one or more individuals demonstrating originality in design or execution
- Production of new knowledge

- Development of new technologies, pedagogy, methods, materials, or uses
- Integration of knowledge leading to new understanding
- Application of knowledge to consequential problems

8. Departmental Criteria for Post-Tenure Review

The University of West Florida adheres to Florida Board of Governors' Regulation 10.003, as well as Article 11 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, in all matters relating to post-tenure review. Additionally, the Department of English endorses the University standard that post-tenure review criteria should consider the faculty member's performance holistically over the five-year post-tenure review period and not solely over the period of a single annual assignment or evaluation. With this standard in mind, the department endorses the following post-tenure review criteria for teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity:

A. Scholarship and Creative Activity Post-Tenure Review Criteria

Over the five-year period of post-tenure review, a candidate for post-tenure review in the Department of English must have published a minimum of the following to receive a PTR rating of "Meets Expectations" for Scholarship/Creative Activity:

- Two peer-reviewed single-author articles or multi-author articles on which the faculty member serves as primary author (literature and composition faculty), two short stories or literary nonfiction essays (creative writing faculty), or eight poems or eight pages of poetry (for online literary journal poetry publications that meet the quality indicators contained herein, twenty lines of poetry or less shall constitute a page of poetry) in two or more literary journals (creative writing faculty); *or*
- Three edited issues (all published during the 5-year PTR review window) of a national literary or academic journal for which the faculty member serves as the head or primary editor; *or*
- A combination, equivalent to the above, of peer-reviewed publications and extensive evidence of non-traditional scholarly activity as identified herein (composition faculty and other faculty whose official work assignments include administrative roles).

Over the five-year period of post-tenure review, a candidate for post-tenure review in the Department of English must have published a minimum of the following to receive a PTR rating of "Exceeds Expectations" for Scholarship/Creative Activity:

- A single-author book (literature or composition faculty) or a single-author book of creative writing (creative writing faculty); *or*
- One edited collection or critical edition of scholarship or creative writing; *or*
- Quantifiable publication of the items identified in the "Meets Expectations" section herein in an amount above the PTR "Meets Expectations" standard for Scholarship/Creative Activity.

In addition to the quantity of a candidate's publication, the following relevant quality indicators for publications should also be considered when evaluating the publications of a candidate for post-tenure review:

Quality Indicators for Literary Studies and Composition and Rhetoric Studies Publications:

- Peer review.
- National and/or international distribution.
- University sponsorship or established independent literary reputation.
- Reputable editors with established and demonstrable national literary pedigrees.
- A wide range of national and/or international contributors/authors with established national and/or international reputations.

Quality Indicators for Creative Writing Publications:

- Competitive editorial policy.
- Frequent representation in year-end anthologies such as *Best American Poetry/Short Stories/Essays*, *O'Henry Prize Anthology*, and *Pushcart Prize Anthology*.
- National and/or international distribution.
- University sponsorship or established independent literary reputation.
- Reputable editors with established and demonstrable national literary pedigrees.
- A wide range of national and/or international contributors/authors with established national reputations.

B. Teaching and Service Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The Department of English extends the annual evaluation criteria defined herein for a faculty member's teaching and service to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching and service over the five-year post-tenure review period. A faculty member's comprehensive post-tenure review rating in service and teaching shall reflect the annual evaluation ratings (inclusive of both the Dean and Chair ratings) received by the faculty member in each category of teaching and service over the five-year post-tenure review window. Over the five-year period of post-tenure review, a faculty member's receiving of consistent "Meets Expectations" annual evaluation ratings in teaching and/or service shall constitute the PTR rating standard of "Meets Expectations" for teaching and/or service for the post-tenure review. Over the five-year period of post-tenure review, a faculty member's receiving of consistent "Exceeds Expectations" annual evaluation ratings in teaching and/or service shall constitute the PTR rating standard of "Exceeds Expectations" for teaching and/or service for the post-tenure review.

9. Additional Departmental Considerations for Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

A. Departmental Faculty in Administrative Roles

For tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review for faculty in official administrative roles, the following non-exhaustive list constitutes scholastic activity to be considered in addition or substitution to the items identified elsewhere herein. The non-traditional forms of scholarship mentioned here shall be assessed in terms of quality, scope, and impact according to the standard of peer review used for

traditional article and book publications. The impact of the research may be inferred by the size of the audience and the nature of that audience. In cases where peer review is unavailable, it will be incumbent upon the faculty member to provide objective measures of quality, scope, and impact of the work. In all cases, the department chair may elect to request peer review of any materials submitted as scholarship that have not been previously reviewed by a traditional peer-review process. The chair may request this review with or without consulting the faculty member. For all of the below, scholarship may be single- or multi-authored works.

- Custom textbook publications
- Webtexts or multimodal compositions
- Published Interviews
- Community-based research and service-learning initiatives
- Institutional and cross-institutional research
- Performances and exhibits
- Policy analysis
- Grant award projects

B. Consideration of Publication Timelines and Schedules

Because the publishing schedules of many academic, university, and literary presses often extend over several years, candidates may credit single-author or co-authored monographs, single-author or co-authored books (as appropriate to each candidate's field/discipline) or single-author or co-authored articles or book chapters that are under contract or "in-press" from a press or journal but not yet available, as justification for tenure and post-tenure review. In such cases, the candidate must provide all relevant documentation of contracts as well as galley proofs and/or publication schedules.

C. Collaborative, Multi-Author Publications

For collaborative, multi-author publications, candidates will document their contributions and roles in the publication. For example, first or primary author, second-author, etc. Candidates will also explain the scope of their individual contributions, noting as well the nature of their contributions (such as developing the theoretical frame, conducting data-collection, serving as primary investigator, contributing analysis and discussion etc.) In cases where co-authorship has involved equal contributions by all authors, candidates will indicate this if it is not clearly indicated in the publication itself.

D. Additional Publication Modes

The publication modes identified herein do not represent an exhaustive or exclusive list of the ways in which a faculty member can receive a successful tenure or post-tenure review decision. Awards, conference papers/presentations, public readings, multi-modal publications, and digital publications, among many other publication modes, all represent important scholarship and creative activities and should all influence the evaluation of scholarship and creative activity for a tenure or post-tenure review decision.

10. Departmental Criteria for Promotion to the Ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer

The UWF guidelines for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor and Senior Lecturer state that UWF departments should develop departmental criteria for promotion to the ranks of Senior Lecturer and Senior Instructor in addition to the minimum University criteria for promotion to these positions. The Department of English requires that successful candidates for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer meet at least one of the following additional departmental criteria:

- The candidate has an established record of annual evaluation ratings where a majority of the ratings (inclusive of all Dean and Chair annual ratings) are at the level of “Exceeds Expectations/Distinguished.” This level of evaluation is an enhancement of the University standard for promotion; *or*
- The candidate has an established and documented record of incorporating high impact practices into their teaching and service. The University provides examples of the types of practices that qualify as HIPs here: <https://uwf.edu/academic-engagement-and-student-affairs/departments/career-development-and-community-engagement/students-and-alumni/gain-relevant-experience/high-impact-practices/>. This list should not be seen as an exhaustive list of HIPs. However, the scope and spirit of the activities identified by the University should guide an understanding of what constitutes a HIP; *or*
- The candidate has an established and documented record of service at the Department and College level with additional service initiatives that impact the University, community, and/or the faculty member’s academic, creative, and scholarly discipline(s). The department extends the annual evaluation guidelines’ service activity examples in the Department of English bylaws to the eligible service activities for promotion review to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer; *or*
- The candidate has an established and documented record of administrative work at the “Meets” or “Exceeds Expectations” level at UWF (in addition to the candidate’s teaching and service expectations). These administrative activities may be in a formalized role such as Coordinator, Director, or Assistant/Associate Chair, or in another recognized administrative role that emphasizes the oversight, direction/coordination, and/or mentorship of faculty peers or students. These types of administrative duties should be reflected in the candidate’s work assignments and annual evaluations during some or all the pre-promotion window of employment. These activities should contribute to the functional success of the Department, College, and/or University.

A candidate for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer in the Department of English should clearly document evidence for these Departmental Criteria in the candidate’s application for promotion to the ranks of Senior Instructor or Senior Lecturer.

11. Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion in Literary Studies

A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor of Literary Studies at UWF must have published a minimum of:

- One book of original criticism, theory, or literary biography/history **OR** its equivalent in publication of individual essays, reviews, edited collections, and edited editions.

A candidate for promotion to Professor of Literary Studies at UWF must have published a minimum of:

- Two books of original criticism, theory, or literary biography/history; *or*
- One book of original criticism, theory, or literary biography/history, **PLUS** its equivalent in publication of individual essays, reviews, edited collections, and edited editions.
- The publication of individual essays, reviews, edited collections, and edited editions equivalent to two books of original criticism, theory, or literary biography/history.

For a candidate seeking promotion to Professor of Literary Studies at UWF, at least one book of original criticism, theory, or literary biography/history or its equivalent in publication of individual essays, reviews, edited collections, and edited editions must have been published following his or her promotion to Associate Professor.

Simply meeting the minimum publication requirements outlined above does not guarantee a candidate's successful tenure and/or promotion. In addition to the quantity of published writing, the following quality indicators for distinguished literary journals and presses should also be considered when evaluating the publications of a candidate seeking tenure and/or promotion in literary studies:

- Peer review.
- National and/or international distribution.
- University sponsorship or established independent literary reputation.
- Reputable editors with established and demonstrable national literary pedigrees.
- A wide range of national and/or international contributors/authors with established national and/or international reputations.

12. Departmental Standards for Tenure and Promotion in Creative Writing

A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor of Creative Writing at UWF must have published a minimum of:

- One book of original creative writing **OR** its equivalent in publication of individual poems, essays, short stories, and/or other pieces of creative writing.

A candidate for promotion to Professor of Creative Writing at UWF must have published a minimum of:

- Two books of original creative writing; *or*
- One book of original creative writing **PLUS** its equivalent in publication of individual poems, essays, short stories, and/or other pieces of creative writing; *or*
- The publication of individual poems, essays, short stories, and/or other pieces of creative writing equivalent to two books of original creative writing.

For a candidate seeking promotion to Professor of Creative Writing at UWF, at least one book or its equivalent in publication of individual poems, essays, short stories, and/or other pieces of creative writing must have been published following his or her promotion to Associate Professor.

For tenure, post-tenure review, and/or promotion in creative writing, a “book of original creative writing” is inclusive of, but not limited to:

- A volume of 48 or more pages of poetry; *or*
- A volume of short fiction or a collection of short stories; *or*
- A novel or novella; *or*
- A volume of creative nonfiction.

Simply meeting the minimum publication requirements outlined above does not guarantee a candidate’s successful tenure and/or promotion. In addition to the quantity of published creative writing, the following quality indicators for distinguished literary journals and presses should also be considered when evaluating the publications of a candidate seeking tenure and/or promotion in creative writing:

- Competitive editorial policy.
- Frequent representation in year-end anthologies such as *Best American Poetry/Short Stories/Essays*, *O’Henry Prize Anthology*, and *Pushcart Prize Anthology*.
- National and/or international distribution.
- University sponsorship or established independent literary reputation.
- Reputable editors with established and demonstrable national literary pedigrees.
- A wide range of national and/or international contributors/authors with established national reputations.

13. Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion in Composition and Rhetoric Studies.

A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor of Composition and Rhetoric Studies at UWF must have published a minimum of:

- One book of original criticism, theory, pedagogical/assessment praxis, or research/program methodology **OR** its equivalent in publication of individual essays, reviews, edited collections, and edited editions **OR** a combination, equivalent to the above, of peer-reviewed publications and extensive evidence of non-traditional scholarly activity as identified herein.

A candidate for promotion to Professor of Composition and Rhetoric Studies at UWF must have published a minimum of:

- Two books of original criticism, theory, pedagogical/assessment praxis, or research and/or program methodology; *or*
- One book of original criticism, theory, or research/program methodology, **PLUS** its equivalent in publication of individual essays, reviews, edited collections, and edited editions; *or*
- The publication of individual essays, reviews, edited collections, and edited editions equivalent to two books of original criticism, theory, or research/program methodology; *or*

- A combination, equivalent to the above, of peer-reviewed publications and extensive evidence of non-traditional scholarly activity as identified herein.

For a candidate seeking promotion to Professor of Composition and Rhetoric Studies at UWF, at least one book of original criticism, theory, pedagogical/assessment praxis, or research/program methodology or its equivalent in publication of individual essays, reviews, edited collections, and edited editions must have been published following his or her promotion to Associate Professor.

Simply meeting the minimum publication requirements outlined above does not guarantee a candidate's successful tenure and/or promotion. In addition to the quantity of published writing, the following quality indicators for distinguished literary journals and presses should also be considered when evaluating the publications of a candidate seeking tenure and/or promotion in Composition and Rhetoric Studies:

- Peer review.
- National and/or international distribution.
- University sponsorship or established independent literary reputation.
- Reputable editors with established and demonstrable national pedigrees.
- A wide range of national and/or international contributors/authors with established national and/or international reputations.

E. Promotion and Tenure: Procedure

1. Current university policy directs that the department chair solicit signed peer evaluations of candidacies for promotion from "all full-time faculty in the department." A department member may decline to submit such an evaluation.

Current policy specifies the same procedure for tenure candidacies and further requires that "all full-time tenured faculty in the department...complete a secret vote" on same.

Tenured professors of languages other than English will vote on tenure candidacies in English, as will tenured English professors on candidacies in other languages.

2. Signed peer evaluations of candidacies for promotion or tenure should be submitted as argued statements of support or non-support. Current policy requires that all such statements be included in the candidacy folder that is forwarded to review committees and officers.

F. Promotion and Tenure: Mentoring

1. During the first semester of a faculty member's appointment to a tenure-earning position, the chair will assign the candidate an advisory committee of tenured faculty from within the department and, if requested by the faculty member, one non-departmental tenured faculty member. The committee will be charged to assist the candidate's progress toward tenure and to discuss with the candidate and the chair its specific recommendations for that progress.

The committee will be associated with the non-tenured faculty member until the year of the candidate's review for tenure, and will develop its advice in conjunction with the annual evaluation process. At the outset of that process, the chair will ask the candidate's permission to share with the committee all materials that the candidate has submitted for appraisal. In the chair's absence, the committee will discuss with the candidate its assessment of those materials and its recommendations. The committee will then confer with the chair, who will take its views into account in drafting the annual report of the candidate's "progress toward tenure" that university policy requires the chair to submit. The chair will discuss that draft with the committee and with the candidate, and will then submit to both the "progress" report in final form. If the candidate wishes, he or she may submit for inclusion in the file a written commentary upon and/or rebuttal to the chair's report.

2. Mentoring Committee Membership: The chair will appoint two tenured faculty to each committee. If the non-tenured faculty member requests, the committee will be enlarged to include another tenured faculty member of his or her choice. The committee will designate one member its secretary, to be responsible for circulating materials and convening meetings.

Article VII. Annual Evaluation

The performance of tenure-line faculty will be evaluated annually, in accordance with the guidelines detailed in Article VI. Full-time, non-tenure-eligible instructors need not present evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and will be evaluated in accord with the guidelines in Article VI for Teaching and Service only.

ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA – MULTIPLE CATEGORIES

When a professional initiative or work by a faculty member contains multiple components that overlap more than one of a professor's annual evaluation categories, the professor may list the same initiative or work in more than one of the annual evaluation categories on an annual review. However, the faculty member must identify and document in the submitted annual evaluation the specific components of the initiative or work that qualify for each category of annual evaluation consistent with each category's annual evaluation standards as defined in the departmental bylaws.

SCHOLARSHIP AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

All tenure-line and tenured professors in the Department of English participate in the tenure/post-tenure review system that has clearly defined scholarship expectations based on university and departmental tenure standards. A faculty member's annual scholarship/creative activity rating is based on the progress a tenure-line or tenured faculty member is making towards his or her tenure evaluation or subsequent post-tenure review.

Annual evaluation ratings in Scholarship/Creative Activity are based on the following criteria:

An "Exceeds Expectations" annual evaluation in Scholarship/Creative Activity is warranted when a faculty member is clearly exceeding the quality/quantity standards of publication as defined herein for his or her tenure evaluation or subsequent post-tenure review.

A "Meets Expectations" annual evaluation in Scholarship/Creative Activity is warranted when a faculty member is meeting the quality/quantity standards of publication as defined herein for his or her tenure evaluation or subsequent post-tenure review.

A "Does Not Meet Expectations" annual evaluation in Scholarship/Creative Activity is warranted when a faculty member does not meet the standards as outlined herein for "Meets Expectations."

An "Unsatisfactory" annual evaluation in Scholarship/Creative Activity is warranted when a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

TEACHING STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

The department has adopted the following calculation method for interpreting the quantitative student responses in academic year course-related Student Assessment of Instruction documents. The quantitative standard is inclusive of all instruction and course-related categories for all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year. The department also recognizes that in some circumstances outside the faculty member's control Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) documents may be unrepresentative of teaching quality for a course or courses. In such circumstances, the faculty member should document these concerns in the faculty member's annual statement and provide sufficient additional materials to accurately represent the quality of teaching.

Because of statistically significant deviations from the mean, lower-division/General Education and online-only courses receive additional adjustments as outlined below:

- Lower-division/General Education, in-person courses receive a +5% adjustment to course percentage of "Excellent" or "Very Good" ratings inclusive of all categories for the individual course.
- Online-only courses and hybrid online/face-to-face graduate or undergraduate courses receive a +10% adjustment to course percentage of "Excellent" or "Very Good" ratings inclusive of all categories for the individual course. Where a hybrid online/face-to-face course contains separate SAIs for the online and face-to-face components, the combined SAIs will be considered together as a single class.
- Courses which are both lower-division/General Education and online-only receive a +15% adjustment to course percentage of "Excellent" or "Very Good" ratings inclusive of all categories for the individual course.

To calculate the overall adjusted percentage of "Excellent" or "Very Good" ratings for the academic year, the faculty member averages the adjusted percentages for all courses taught. The example calculation below is based on the assumption that a faculty member taught a varied course load of four courses per semester and received a raw score average of 80% "Excellent" or "Very Good" ratings on each course:

- Fall Course One. Upper Division: 80% (Avg. "Ex" or "VG") + 0% adjustment = 80%
- Fall Course Two. Upper Division: 80% (Avg. "Ex" or "VG") + 0% adjustment = 80%

- Fall Course Three. Lower Division/General Education, Not Online: 80% (Avg. "Ex" or "VG") + 5% adjustment = 85%
- Fall Course Four. Lower Division/General Education, Online: 80% (Avg. "Ex" or "VG") + 15% adjustment = 95%
- Spring Course One. Upper Division: 80% (Avg. "Ex" or "VG") + 0% adjustment = 80%
- Spring Course Two. Upper Division: 80% (Avg. "Ex" or "VG") + 0% adjustment = 80%
- Spring Course Three. Upper Division, Online: 80% (Avg. "Ex" or "VG") + 10% adjustment = 90%
- Spring Course Four. Lower Division/General Education, Online: 80% (Avg. "Ex" or "VG") + 15% adjustment = 95%

The total percentage would be calculated by dividing 685 (80+80+85+95+80+80+90+95) by 8, which equals 85.6. As outlined below, the teaching in the above scenario would earn a Distinguished teaching evaluation for the year by surpassing the overall academic year department quantitative-only standard of 85%.

Annual evaluation ratings in Teaching are based on the following criteria:

An Exceeds Expectations" annual evaluation in Teaching is warranted when a faculty member has achieved **ONE** of the following:

- 80% or above "Excellent" or "Very Good" adjusted ratings inclusive of all instruction and course-related categories of all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year.
- 75% or above "Excellent" or "Very Good" adjusted ratings inclusive of all instruction and course-related categories of all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year PLUS a preponderance of supportive anonymous student comments.
- Documentation (through provided additional materials) of teaching practices representative of distinguished teaching.
- Substantial pedagogical or programmatic implementation/revision/maintenance.
- A university-wide teaching award over the previous three years.
- A college-wide teaching award corresponding to the year of receipt.
- An approved course HIP designation and/or a HIP Grant award or The Living Lab Grant award for special HIP projects, corresponding to the year of receipt.

A "Meets Expectations" annual evaluation in Teaching is warranted when a faculty member has achieved **ONE** of the following:

- 70% or above "Excellent" or "Very Good" adjusted ratings inclusive of all instruction and course-related categories of all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year.
- 65% or above "Excellent" or "Very Good" adjusted ratings inclusive of all instruction and course-related categories of all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year PLUS a preponderance of supportive anonymous student comments.
- Documentation (through provided additional materials) of teaching practices representative of excellent teaching.
- Moderate pedagogical or programmatic implementation/revision/maintenance.

A "Does Not Meet Expectations" annual evaluation in Teaching is warranted when a faculty member's teaching does not meet the standards as outlined herein for "Meets Expectations."

An "Unsatisfactory" annual evaluation in Teaching is warranted when a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

CONSIDERATIONS RELATED TO STUDENT SAI RESPONSE RATE

When the student SAI response rate per an individual course falls below 50% of the final course official attendance number, and, as such, is not statistically representative of the course population, the faculty member may elect not to include the SAI numbers for the individual class in the mathematical calculation of "adjusted ratings inclusive of all instruction and course-related categories of all academic courses a faculty member teaches during the academic year." However, the SAIs shall still be included in evaluation submission files where required and still may be utilized in the evaluation of the faculty member.

VOLUNTARY PEER TEACHING OBSERVATION AND REVIEW PROCESS

As an additional "teaching exemplar" that may be utilized by faculty to document the quality and scope of their teaching in the annual evaluation process, the department supports the inclusion of voluntary peer observations and reviews of classroom teaching. The parameters of a voluntary peer teaching observation shall be as follows:

- Any peer teaching observation shall be voluntary on behalf of both the person conducting the observation and the person being observed.
- The faculty members shall meet before the class to discuss the expectations for the course lesson and classroom observation.
- The faculty member conducting the peer observation and review shall provide a written letter/assessment to the observed faculty member following the teaching observation.
- The letter/assessment shall focus exclusively on the observed teaching of the faculty peer and shall not include ancillary observations unrelated to the faculty member's teaching.
- The faculty member conducting the observation will provide the letter prior to the conclusion of the same semester during which the peer faculty member is observed.
- The faculty member being observed has the sole right to include or not include the letter/review as a teaching exemplar in the observed faculty member's annual evaluation materials.
- Any letter/review included in annual evaluation materials must be included in its entirety and signed and dated by the faculty peer conducting the observation.
- If the Department Chair is the peer reviewer or is to accompany the peer reviewer, the observation will follow the classroom observation procedures defined in the CBA.

- If a peer observation and review letter is included as an additional exemplar of teaching in the process outlined here, the peer observation letter/review shall have equivalent weight and assessment authority in the evaluation as the corresponding SAls to the observed class.
- Should a faculty member include peer observation/reviews in their annual evaluation materials for multiple, consecutive years, the same peer evaluator cannot be used by the same faculty member more frequently than once every three academic years.

SERVICE STANDARDS FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS

EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE

Consistent with Article IV Committee Structure of the Department of English Bylaws, the Department Chair shall assign membership to the departmental committees no later than one week after the first departmental meeting of the fall semester. The Chair shall take steps to ensure equitable distribution of committee assignments across all in-unit departmental faculty members. Should a faculty member assert that departmental committee assignments are being applied inequitably, the faculty member will consult first with the Chair about a resolution and then may appeal committee assignments to the Dean or representative.

The Department of English requires that faculty participate actively and productively in departmental service obligations to receive a “meets” or “exceeds expectations” rating in Service in addition to the additional service annual evaluation expectations defined herein.

The Department of English endorses the following requirements and expectations for departmental service and committee assignments, charges, and participation expectations:

- Assignments and committee work may vary in intensity from year to year for some departmental committees (such as Curriculum) and remain relatively consistent in expectation and intensity of work in other committees (such as Assessment or faculty mentoring committees).
- Because committee work may vary in intensity and assignment from year to year, evaluation of a faculty member’s participation and work on departmental committees must be in relation to a specific committee charge given in writing by the Chair to the committee or to a specific charge/initiative generated by the members of the committee and documented in writing in committee notes, emails, or meeting minutes.
- Departmental committees shall, when practicable, provide at least one week’s notice for meetings and shall provide options for attendance in-person or virtually.
- Departmental committees shall solicit committee member feedback on meeting availability dates and times prior to scheduling a meeting.
- To receive annual evaluation credit for service on a departmental committee (inclusive of standing committees, ad-hoc committees, and search committees) a faculty member must demonstrate participation in the departmental committee.
- To receive credit for participation on an individual departmental committee, the committee member shall be prepared to provide evidence and documentation of their participation and contributions in response to the committee’s charges for the year. This evidence may be in the form of produced documents, confirmation of a faculty member’s participation and committee

contributions by the other members of the committee, or direct observation by the Chair of a committee member's committee participation.

FACULTY SERVICE EXPECTATIONS IN ADDITION TO "EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE"

The department defines the items in the following non-exhaustive list as important service-related activities in addition to "Expectations for Departmental Faculty Service":

- Additional distinguished departmental service clearly exceeding the departmental service requirements defined herein.
- Membership in one university or college committee such as faculty senate, UPC, CPC, Personnel, or university hiring committee.
- Documented substantial service to the profession.
- Leadership role in a professional society.
- Leadership role in the UWF Chapter of the United Faculty of Florida.
- Membership/Active role in university shared governance organizations
- Implementation, development, and/or maintenance of programs (GTA Training Program, opening of satellite Writing Lab, Technical Writing Certificate Programs, for example)
- Distinguished service as program director or coordinator (Writing Lab, Creative Writing, and Composition)
- Distinguished service as Assistant Department Chair
- Distinguished service as administrator/supervisor of Technical Writing Certificate Program, Writing and Editing Internship program, or equivalent.
- Establishment of substantial inter-departmental relationships between one or more UWF programs
- Official Mentoring of one or more GTAs.
- Observations of teachers and/or graduate students
- Distinguished service to the community as a UWF representative.
- Guest lecturer on UWF campus or in the community as a representative of UWF/English Department
- Faculty advisor for student organization
- Publications within the field (non-tenure-track faculty)
- Presentations at conferences of professional organizations or university groups (non-tenure-track faculty)

Annual evaluation ratings in Service are based on the following criteria:

An "Exceeds Expectations" annual evaluation in Service is warranted when a faculty member fulfils "Expectations for Faculty Departmental Service" as defined herein AND achieves TWO of the items in "Faculty Service Expectations in Addition to Expectations for Faculty Departmental Service" in an academic year.

A "Meets Expectations" annual evaluation in Service is warranted when a faculty member fulfils "Expectations for Faculty Departmental Service" as defined herein AND achieves ONE of the items in "Faculty Service Expectations in Addition to Expectations for Faculty Departmental Service" in an academic year.

A "Does Not Meet Expectations" annual evaluation in Service is warranted when a faculty member does not meet the standards as outlined herein for "Meets Expectations."

An "Unsatisfactory" annual evaluation in Service is warranted when a faculty member disregards or fails to address remediation efforts by the university to provide correction or assistance for performance that does not meet expectations, or performance involving incompetence or misconduct as defined in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable university regulations and policies.

Article VIII. Amendments:

These bylaws may be altered or amended in any fall or spring department meeting by a two-thirds vote of the members present, provided that the text of the proposed amendment has been submitted to the department chair and distributed to the voting membership at least seven days before the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered.

Article IX. Summer Teaching Assignment Prioritization Guidelines.

Each academic year, the chair will request summer course teaching preferences from in-unit faculty, and courses shall be assigned based on the following guidelines:

- Should the departmental in-unit faculty demand for supplemental summer teaching assignments exceed the departmental supply of available courses in a given summer, the chair will prioritize allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments to the in-unit faculty who have taught the fewest number of summer courses over sequentially compared previous summers.
- in-unit faculty members receive priority for supplemental summer teaching assignments.
- Following the initial allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments, no summer course or courses of an in-unit faculty member will be reallocated to another faculty member without the consent of the in-unit faculty member to whom the course or courses were initially assigned.
- The salary amount a faculty member receives for teaching a summer course or courses shall not be a consideration in the prioritization or allocation of supplemental summer teaching assignments.

Article XI. Bylaws Severability

The provisions of these Bylaws are severable, and if any provision shall be held invalid or unenforceable, that invalidity or unenforceability shall attach only to that provision and shall not in any manner affect or render invalid or unenforceable any other provision of these Bylaws, and these Bylaws shall be carried out as if the invalid or unenforceable provision were not contained herein.

Article XII Relationship of English Bylaws to the Collective Bargaining Agreement

In instances where the collective bargaining agreement between the UWF chapter of United Faculty of Florida and the UWF Board of Trustees authorizes departments/units to define and/or clarify terms and

conditions of employment related specifically to the English department, these bylaws constitute the sole and exclusive document wherein those department-specific terms and conditions reside.

Article XIII Course Modality

The Chair will consider the following best practices when assigning course modalities (online, face-to-face, or a hybrid of online/face-to-face). When assigning course modalities for department courses, the Chair will:

- Consider equitable course-modality opportunities for departmental faculty across an individual semester and potentially multiple years of course assignments.
- Make course-modality choices that emphasize maximizing the quality of program offerings across the department as guided by departmental mission and values.
- Maintain a sufficient pool of adjunct faculty able to teach in multiple modalities to support equitable opportunity as defined above.
- Consider and convey clearly to the department any university expectations or guidelines governing the proportion of online, face-to-face, or hybrid modalities of classes to be offered by the department.

Article XII. Allocation of Department Offices

The allocation of faculty offices in the Department of English, whether on an individual faculty office basis or multiple faculty offices basis, shall be prioritized based on the criteria contained herein. The Department of English also recognizes the University's authority to determine what spaces constitute faculty office space, programmatic space, mixed-use space, and any other facilities designation. These allocation guidelines apply only to space designated for individual faculty offices.

Available office space for Department of English faculty will be allocated based first upon faculty rank and second upon longevity, where longevity is defined as the total number of years of the faculty member's career at UWF as a full-time faculty member, irrespective of rank. For determining prioritization order, faculty will first be ordered by rank, and then, within each rank, faculty will be ordered by longevity. The following faculty rank ordering will be used: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior instructor, instructor, visiting, emeriti, adjunct/OPS-funded. Because adjunct/OPS-funded faculty are employed under limited-term/non-renewing contracts, office assignments given to adjunct/OPS-funded faculty shall be for the term of their current contract. For adjunct/OPS-funded faculty office allocations, the Chair shall have discretion on assigning available office space in compliance with this allocation language, and the Chair shall consider programmatic need and longevity of service among any other relevant criteria when allocating office space to adjunct/OPS-funded faculty.

Should a tie result in both rank and longevity in the prioritization order, the tied faculty members will then be ordered prioritizing the greater number of years in current rank. If a tie still results between the faculty members following the reordering, the faculty members will be consulted first to see if their preferences are in conflict. If no conflict exists within the faculty preferences of tied faculty, the office

allocations will take place simultaneously. If the preferences of tied faculty are in conflict, the conflict will be resolved by a statistically objective and equal measure such as a coin flip.

Full-time departmental faculty members who have a joint appointment between the Department of English and another UWF department or administrative position outside of the Department of English will be assigned office space in the Department of English based on the proportion of the faculty member's FTE devoted to the Department of English. If a full-time faculty member's appointment is .5 FTE (50%) or higher in the Department of English and the faculty member requests an office in the Department of English, the faculty member will be included in the prioritization allocations based on the faculty member's rank and longevity. If a faculty member's FTE in the Department of English is less than .5 FTE (50%) of the faculty member's assignment, the faculty member may still request office space in the department, but the faculty member, irrespective of rank or longevity, will not be included in the prioritization allocations of the Department of English ahead of full-time English faculty who have a majority FTE in the Department of English.

These allocation guidelines apply only to available office space and do not create a right for an individual faculty member to require the removal of another faculty member from a Department of English office.

Article XIII. Program Review

The Department of English understands that Program review is a necessary part of the accreditation process and of gauging the status of the program. The Department relies upon the policy and guidelines supplied by Academic Affairs with the additional caveat that faculty have a role in determining reviewers through consultation with the Chair and the Dean of the College of Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities. In preparation for program review, the Chair will convene a department meeting to solicit faculty input on a list of potential reviewers. Initial communication with reviewers is done by the dean. Final decision of reviewers is made by the dean from the list provided by the department and after consultation with the Chair.

Updated 08-11-04

Updated 12/5/13

Updated 4/8/16

Updated 5/4/17

Updated 11/10/17

Updated 2/8/19

Updated 9/9/22

Updated 4/28/23

Updated 2/9/24

Updated 5/14/25